



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,546	02/27/2002	Kunihiko Koroyasu	500.41279X00	5572

20457 7590 04/14/2004

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP  
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET  
SUITE 1800  
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889

EXAMINER

HASSANZADEH, PARVIZ

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1763

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/083,546	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KOROYASU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Parviz Hassanzadeh	<b>Art Unit</b> 1763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,4 and 6-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 February 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1763

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election without traverse of Species 1 of Group I, apparatus claims 1,2, 5, in Paper No. 9/15/03 is acknowledged.

Claims 3,4, 6-9 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species and method, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 9/15/03.

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 19, line 12, please correct or confirm and explain the word "larger";

On page 25, line 7, it is suggested to change 5 to 105.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to because in Fig. 3b, the numeral label 10 should be 105. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drewery et al (US Patent No. 6,620,736 B2) in view of Tamura et al (JP 2001-057361-A).**

Drewery et al teach a plasma processing apparatus (Fig. 1) in which a workpiece is processed by a plasma, the apparatus including: a ring 40 wherein the outer surface of the ring 40 or 60 as shown in Fig. 3 may be formed of a dielectric coating 63 (column 4, lines 11-28 and column 6, 6-19).

Drewery et al fail to teach the coating layer formed of a plasma resistance and water-absorbing resin material.

Tamura et al teach a plasma processing apparatus wherein a wall surface of the chamber is covered with a protective layer such as a polyetherimide (a plasma resistance and water-absorbing resin) in order to protect the chamber surface against plasma corrosion.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the protective material as taught by Tamura et al in the apparatus of Drewery et al as a dielectric protective layer 63 in order to protect the surface of the ring 60 against plasma corrosion.

*Further regarding claims 1, 2:* claims contain the method limitation, “swelling and shrinking or when it absorbs water” which is a method limitation in a product claim and has been

Art Unit: 1763

given little to no patentable weight. It has been found that even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process. See *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

*Further regarding claim 5:* the selection of the thickness of the protective dielectric layer is considered *result-effective variable parameter* that would have been obtainable through routine experimentation and optimization process. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Allen*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Jennings (US Patent No. 6,200,388 B1) teach a wafer support covered with a protective layer; and

Daugherty et al (US Patent No. 6,344,105 B1) teach a plasma reactor including an edge ring 108 surrounding a wafer support 104.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Parviz Hassanzadeh whose telephone number is (571)272-1435.

The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

Art Unit: 1763

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on (571)272-1439. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*P. Hassanzadeh*  
Parviz Hassanzadeh  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1763

April 8, 2004